

SCIP #4
GRANT

APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
Revised 4/99

IMPORTANT: Please consult the "Instructions for Completing the Project Application" for assistance in completion of this form.

SUBDIVISION: City of St. Bernard CODE# 061-69470

DISTRICT NUMBER: 2 COUNTY: Hamilton DATE 08 / 19 / 08

CONTACT: Jennifer L. Vatter PHONE # (513) 721-5500

(THE PROJECT CONTACT PERSON SHOULD BE THE INDIVIDUAL WHO WILL BE AVAILABLE ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS DURING THE APPLICATION REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS AND WHO CAN BEST ANSWER OR COORDINATE THE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS)

FAX (513) 721-0607 E-MAIL jvatter@jmaconsult.com

PROJECT NAME: Jefferson Avenue Improvements

SUBDIVISION TYPE

(Check only 1)

- ☐ 1. County
☒ 2. City
☐ 3. Township
☐ 4. Village
☐ 5. Water/Sanitary District
(Section 6119 O.R.C.)

FUNDING TYPE REQUESTED

(Check All Requested & Enter Amount)

- ☒ 1. Grant \$ 435,000.00
☐ 2. Loan \$ _____
☐ 3. Loan Assistance \$ _____

PROJECT TYPE

(Check Largest Component)

- ☒ 1. Road
☐ 2. Bridge/Culvert
☐ 3. Water Supply
☐ 4. Wastewater
☐ 5. Solid Waste
☐ 6. Stormwater

TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$ 870,000.00

FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 435,000.00

2008 SEP 19 PM 12:26
OFFICE OF NEW BURLINGTON
COUNTY ENGINEER

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION

To be completed by the District Committee ONLY

GRANT: \$ 435,000

SCIP LOAN: \$ _____

RLP LOAN: \$ _____

LOAN ASSISTANCE: \$ _____

RATE: _____ % TERM: _____ yrs.

RATE: _____ % TERM: _____ yrs.

(Check only 1)

- ☒ State Capital Improvement Program
☐ Local Transportation Improvements Program

☐ Small Government Program

FOR OPWC USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: C _____ / C _____

Local Participation _____ %

OPWC Participation _____ %

Project Release Date: ____ / ____ / ____

OPWC Approval: _____

APPROVED FUNDING: \$ _____

Loan Interest Rate: _____ %

Loan Term: _____ years

Maturity Date: _____

Date Approved: ____ / ____ / ____

SCIP Loan _____ RLP Loan _____

1.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

1.1 PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS:
(Round to Nearest Dollar)

TOTAL DOLLARS

**FORCE ACCOUNT
DOLLARS**

a.) **Basic Engineering Services:** \$ **.00**

Preliminary Design \$ **. 00**

Final Design \$ **. 00**

Bidding \$ **. 00**

Construction Phase \$ **. 00**

Additional Engineering Services \$ **.00**

*Identify services and costs below.

b.) **Acquisition Expenses:**
Land and/or Right-of-Way \$ **.00**

c.) **Construction Costs:** \$ 870,000 **.00**

d.) **Equipment Purchased Directly:** \$ **.00**

e.) **Permits, Advertising, Legal:** \$ **.00**
(Or Interest Costs for Loan Assistance Applications Only)

f.) **Construction Contingencies:** \$ **.00**

g.) **TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS:** \$ 870,000 **.00**

*List Additional Engineering Services here:
Service:

Cost:

1.2 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES:
(Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

	DOLLARS	%
a.) Local In-Kind Contributions	\$ <u> .00</u>	
b.) Local Revenues	\$ <u>435,000 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
c.) Other Public Revenues	\$ <u> .00</u>	
ODOT	\$ <u> .00</u>	
Rural Development	\$ <u> .00</u>	
OEPA	\$ <u> .00</u>	
OWDA	\$ <u> .00</u>	
CDBG	\$ <u> .00</u>	
OTHER _____	\$ <u> .00</u>	
SUBTOTAL LOCAL RESOURCES:	\$ <u>435,000 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
d.) OPWC Funds		
1. Grant	\$ <u>435,000 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
2. Loan	\$ <u> .00</u>	
3. Loan Assistance	\$ <u> .00</u>	
SUBTOTAL OPWC RESOURCES:	\$ <u>435,000 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES:	\$ <u>870,000 .00</u>	<u>100%</u>

1.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS:

Attach a statement signed by the Chief Financial Officer listed in section 5.2 certifying all local share funds required for the project will be available on or before the earliest date listed in the Project Schedule section.

ODOT PID# _____ Sale Date: _____
STATUS: (Check one)
 Traditional
 Local Planning Agency (LPA)
 State Infrastructure Bank

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

If project is multi-jurisdictional, information must be consolidated in this section.

2.1 PROJECT NAME: Jefferson Avenue Improvements

2.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION - (Sections A through C):

A: SPECIFIC LOCATION:

The entire limits of Jefferson Avenue (from Tower to Greenlee) in the City of St. Bernard. Please see attached project vicinity map.

PROJECT ZIP CODE: 45217

B: PROJECT COMPONENTS:

- 1.) Full depth pavement removal and replacement
- 2.) Curb removal and replacement
- 3.) Replace/Add new storm catch basins
- 4.) Upgrade existing storm sewer
- 5.) Install new storm sewer system
- 6.) Seeding and Mulching as necessary
- 7.) Install new curb

C: PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS / CHARACTERISTICS:

Project Length: 1400 LF

Pavement Width: 30 ft.

D: DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:

Detail current service capacity vs. proposed service level.

Road or Bridge: Current ADT 1,100 Year: 2006 Projected ADT: Year:

Water/Wastewater: Based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallons per household, attach current rate ordinance. Current Residential Rate: \$ Proposed Rate: \$

Stormwater: Number of households served: 0

2.3 USEFUL LIFE / COST ESTIMATE: Project Useful Life: 30 Years.

Attach Registered Professional Engineer's statement, with original seal and signature confirming the project's useful life indicated above and estimated cost.

3.0 REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION:

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT **\$ 870,000 .00**

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION **\$.00**

4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE: *

	BEGIN DATE	END DATE
4.1 Engineering/Design:	<u>08 / 01/ 08</u>	<u>06 /01 /09</u>
4.2 Bid Advertisement and Award:	<u>06/ 01/09</u>	<u>07/ 01 /09</u>
4.3 Construction:	<u>07/ 15 /09</u>	<u>12 /30 /10</u>
4.4 Right-of-Way/Land Acquisition:	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

* Failure to meet project schedule may result in termination of agreement for approved projects. Modification of dates must be requested in writing by the CEO of record and approved by the commission once the Project Agreement has been executed. The project schedule should be planned around receiving a Project Agreement on or about July 1st.

5.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION:

5.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE

OFFICER	Bill Burkhardt
TITLE	Mayor
STREET	110 Washington Avenue
CITY/ZIP	St. Bernard, Ohio 45217
PHONE	513-242-7770
FAX	513-641-1840
E-MAIL	

5.2 CHIEF FINANCIAL

OFFICER	Walter St. Clair
TITLE	Auditor
STREET	110 Washington Avenue
CITY/ZIP	St. Bernard, Ohio 45217
PHONE	513-242-7770
FAX	513-641-1840
E-MAIL	

5.3 PROJECT MANAGER

TITLE	Jennifer L. Vatter
STREET	Project Manager
CITY/ZIP	4357 Harrison Avenue
PHONE	Cincinnati, Ohio 45211
FAX	513-721-5500
E-MAIL	513-721-0607

Changes in Project Officials must be submitted in writing from the CEO

6.0 ATTACHMENTS/COMPLETENESS REVIEW:

Confirm in the blocks [] below that each item listed is attached.

- [X] A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to sign and submit this application and execute contracts. This individual should sign under 7.0, Applicant Certification, below.
- [X] A certification signed by the applicant's chief financial officer stating all local share funds required for the project will be available on or before the dates listed in the Project Schedule section. If the application involves a request for loan (RLP or SCIP), a certification signed by the CFO which identifies a specific revenue source for repaying the loan also must be attached. Both certifications can be accomplished in the same letter.
- [] A cooperation agreement (if the project involves more than one subdivision or district) which identifies the fiscal and administrative responsibilities of each participant.
- [X] A registered professional engineer's detailed cost estimate and useful life statement, as required in 164-1-13, 164-1-14, and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimates shall contain an engineer's original seal or stamp and signature, subdivision or district) which identifies the fiscal and administrative responsibilities of each participant.
- [] Projects which include new and expansion components and potentially affect productive farmland should include a statement evaluating the potential impact. If there is a potential impact, the Governor's Executive Order 98-VII and the OPWC Farmland Preservation Review Advisory apply.
- [] Capital Improvements Report: (Required by O.R.C. Chapter 164.06 on standard form)
- [X] Supporting Documentation: Materials such as additional project description, photographs, economic impact (temporary and/or full time jobs likely to be created as a result of the project), accident reports, impact on school zones, and other information to assist your district committee in ranking your project. Be sure to include supplements which may be required by your *local* District Public Works Integrating Committee.

7.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION:

The undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally authorized to request and accept financial assistance from the Ohio Public Works Commission; (2) to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are part of this application are true and correct; (3) all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant; and, (4) should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio Law, including those involving Buy Ohio and prevailing wages.

Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in the application has NOT begun, and will not begin until a Project Agreement on this project has been executed with the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary will result in termination of the agreement and withdrawal of Ohio Public Works Commission funding of the project.

Bill Burkhardt
Certifying Representative

Bill Burkhardt 8-12-08
Signature/Date Signed


Engineer's Estimate

JEFFERSON STREET IMPROVEMENTS

CITY OF ST. BERNARD


DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE	COST
Tree Removed/Clearing	1	LS	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 9,000.00
Excavation/Pavement Removed	3000	CY	\$ 25.00	\$ 75,000.00
Driveway Apron (remove & replace)	300	SY	\$ 60.00	\$ 18,000.00
Curb Removed	2500	LF	\$ 5.00	\$ 12,500.00
Catch Basins/Manholes Removed	10	EA	\$ 500.00	\$ 5,000.00
Concrete Walk (remove & replace)	10000	SF	\$ 7.00	\$ 70,000.00
Pipe Removed	300	LF	\$ 10.00	\$ 3,000.00
Excavation, incl. Embankment (undercut)	800	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 40,000.00
Aggregate Base	1200	CY	\$ 45.00	\$ 54,000.00
Asphalt Concrete Base	420	CY	\$ 150.00	\$ 63,000.00
Asphalt Concrete Surface Course	200	CY	\$ 160.00	\$ 32,000.00
4"-8" Conduit (roof drains & collector)	1500	LF	\$ 20.00	\$ 30,000.00
12"-15" Conduit	700	LF	\$ 100.00	\$ 70,000.00
18"-24" Conduit	400	LF	\$ 140.00	\$ 56,000.00
Catch Basin	12	EA	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 42,000.00
Manhole	8	EA	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 28,000.00
Concrete Curb	2500	LF	\$ 12.00	\$ 30,000.00
Maintain Traffic	1	LS	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
Construction Layout Stakes	1	LS	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Install New Fire Hydrants	4	EA	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 16,000.00
Seed & Mulch Restoration, incl. Topsoil	1000	SY	\$ 10.00	\$ 10,000.00
Utility Conflicts	1	LS	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
Contingencies	1	LS	\$ 146,500.00	\$ 146,500.00
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST				\$ 870,000.00


I hereby certify this to be an accurate estimate of
the proposed project. The useful life of this project
is 30 years.



John R. Goedde, P.E.
JMA Consultants, Inc.

9-16-08
Date





City of St. Bernard


STATUS OF FUNDS CERTIFICATION

The City of St. Bernard will utilize approximately \$435,000.00 from its local budget as its participation for the **Jefferson Avenue Improvements project**.

Walter St. Clair
Auditor, City of St. Bernard

Date Signed

Map of Jefferson Ave, St Bernard, OH 45217

YAHOO! LOCAL
Maps

When using any driving directions or map, it's a good idea to do a reality check and make sure the road still exists, watch out for construction, and follow all traffic safety precautions. This is only to be used as an aid in planning.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 2008

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO MAKE APPLICATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS AND IF FUNDS ARE AWARDED TO EXECUTE GRANT AGREEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of St. Bernard has determined that it would be in the best interest and to promote the general welfare of the community to apply for 2009 State Capital Improvement Program Funds and if funds are awarded to execute a grant agreement on behalf of the City; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO:

Section 1. That the Mayor is hereby authorized to make application(s) for State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) funds for fiscal year 2009.

Section 2. That if funds are awarded the Mayor is hereby authorized to execute a grant agreement or agreements on behalf of the City.

Section 3. This Ordinance is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety. The reason for the emergency is the time frame for the application to be submitted. Therefore, this Ordinance shall take effect immediately by and upon its passage, and the approval of two-thirds of the members of said Council. However, this Ordinance shall take effect on the earliest date provided by law if approved by no more than the majority of the members of Council and in that event the emergency provisions herein are set at naught.

Passed this 4th day of September, 2008.

C. Curtis Woods

President of Council

ATTEST:

M. Sue Kathman
Clerk of Council

Approved this 4th day of September, 2008.

Bill Buskhardt

Mayor

I, M. SUE KATHMAN, CLERK OF COUNCIL, CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO, DO HEREBY testify that the publication of Resolution No. 8, 2008, was made by posting true copies of the same in the most public places designated by Council: St. Bernard Square Bus Stop; Vine Street and Washington Avenue; Bertus Street Park; Greenlee Avenue and Jefferson Avenue; Sullivan Avenue and Delmar Avenue; each for a period of fifteen (15) days or more commencing September 7, 2008.


ATTEST: M. Sue Kathman DATE 9.4.08
Clerk of Council

Approved as to form Kate Boligowski Date 9.4.08
Director of Law

I certify this to be a true copy
of the original document

Date: 9.5.08

Signature: M. Sue Kathman
Clerk of Council, St. Bernard, Ohio



WASHINGTON

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.34
D. 15.48

AVE.

M.H.
El. Inv. 572.12
D. 10.79

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.05
D. 13.81

M.H.
El. Inv. 584.80
D. 5.10

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.00
D. 17.74

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.00
D. 5.10

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.00
D. 5.10

JACKSON

AVE.

AVE.

AVE.

M.H.
El. Inv. 582.50
D. 7.90

M.H.
El. Inv. 567.62
D. 28.99

M.H.
El. Inv. 580.76
D. 11.82

M.H.
El. Inv. 584.76
D. 9.29

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.00
D. 5.10

M.H.
El. Inv. 578.12
D. 12.00

JEFFERSON

AVE.

AVE.

M.H.
El. Inv. 584.61
D. 11.67

M.H.
El. Inv. 586.82
D. 8.80

M.H.
El. Inv. 582.10
D. 12.71

M.H.
El. Inv. 580.80
D. 10.92

M.H.
El. Inv. 578.99
D. 9.99

FRANKLIN

AVE.

M.H.
El. Inv. 595.68
D. 4.00

M.H.
El. Inv. 589.80
D. 8.54

M.H.
El. Inv. 574.16
D. 7.23

Proposed Jet Chamber.
600 Gallon Sewer 1.96%



St. Bernard Fire Department

5116 Vine Street
St. Bernard, Ohio 45217
(513) 242-9555

September 11, 2008
JMA Consultants
John Goedde
RE: Jefferson Ave.

I have reviewed the public fire protection water supply and fire hydrant system as currently situated on Jefferson Avenue, St. Bernard, Ohio, 45217


Jefferson Avenue has two fire hydrants located along its 1150 foot length, one hydrant is located at the intersection of Greenlee Avenue and Jefferson Avenue (the east terminus) of Jefferson Avenue, which is a Class "A" rated, with a flow volume of 1000 – 1500 gpm., the other hydrant is located at the intersection of Sullivan Avenue and Jefferson Avenue (approximately midway between the east and west terminus of Jefferson Ave.) and it is a Class "AA" hydrant with a flow rate of 1500 gpm., plus.

The reconstruction of the public fire protection water supply and fire hydrant system on Jefferson Avenue will provide several improvements to this system.

1. Primarily the addition of a fire hydrant on the west terminus of Jefferson Avenue (at Tower Avenue) will provide a needed fire hydrant for the 200 block of this street. The closest in fire hydrant for the 200 block is located either at Tower and Franklin Aves. (Beyond the most direct route) or on the east side of Tower, near the St. Bernard High School. The fire hydrant located on Tower Avenue at the high school is problematic, in that it is on the opposite side of the street (east), it is over 200 feet from the intersection of Jefferson and Tower, and it presents the difficulty in laying in 5" large diameter hose uphill and around a corner.
2. The replacement of all the fire hydrants on Jefferson Avenue is a component of the City of St. Bernard Fire Department's long term strategic plan of replacing the current Kennedy fire hydrants with Mueller fire hydrants with "Storz" fittings. The City of St. Bernard fire protection water supply has static pressures ranging from 180 – 210 psi. The Kennedy hydrants are designed for static pressures of up to 150 psi. making these hydrants difficult to operate and prone to leakage and stem breakage. The Kennedy hydrants also do not incorporate the "Storz" style hose fittings, which all the large diameter hose used by fire departments require. Mueller hydrants, which are rated for static pressures of 200 psi. equipped with the "Storz" style fittings, will increase the reliability of the public fire protection water supply and fire hydrant system.

If I can be of any more assistance in these matters, please call my office.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steve Scherpenberg", written over the printed name.

Chief Steven Scherpenberg

5116 Vine Street

St. Bernard, Ohio 45217-1020

(513) 242-8474

Email: ss9101@fuse.net

John Goedde

From: "John Goedde" <jgoedde@jmaconsult.com>
To: "Jason DeLaet" <Jason.DeLaet@gcww.cincinnati-oh.gov>
Cc: "Jennifer Vatter" <jvatter@jmaconsult.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 4:48 PM
Subject: Re: St. Bernard Street Improvements

Jason:

Thanks for responding so promptly. Regarding Rose Hill Ln., yes it would probably be combined with improvements to Rose Hill Ave. Also just to reiterate, the City is just in the planning stage and has no firm plan for any of the streets listed. The information from your office will help in prioritizing the projects. Lastly, do you know if Park Pl. would be scheduled for any work by CWW (including replacement) if there is not a street project? Thanks again for your help.

John

----- Original Message -----

From: Jason DeLaet
To: 'John Goedde'
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 2:37 PM
Subject: RE: St. Bernard Street Improvements

John,

I finally heard back from our Planning group as to the need for any GCWW work as part of the below future street improvements. GCWW plans on installing new 8" water mains as part of all the below street improvements, except for Church Street (Burnet to Vine). Everything else we would like to be part of each street improvement project to upgrade our system. Please send me a copy of plans so that I can initiate the First House bill process.

Is Rosehill Lane from Rosehill Ave to Church St going to be part of the below street improvement program? If, so GCWW would like to renew our existing main with an new 8" water main.

Thanks,
 Jason

-----Original Message-----

From: John Goedde [mailto:jgoedde@jmaconsult.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2006 4:07 PM
To: Jason DeLaet
Cc: Jennifer Vatter
Subject: St. Bernard Street Improvements

Jason:

The City of St. Bernard has requested that we contact CWW regarding future street improvement projects, specifically with respect to potential water main replacement. Could you review the following list of streets and verify whether CWW would consider replacement of your existing facilities in conjunction with a street improvement project. We are requesting this information for planning purposes only. In conjunction, the City noted that there has been a significant amount of maintenance work on Park Pl. over the past few years. Are you aware of any specific problems with your facilities on this street? As

5/9/2007

always, any information you could provide is appreciated.

John

Park Place (Bertus St. to Church St.)
Church St. (Burnet Ave. to Vine St.)
Jefferson Ave. (Tower Ave. to Greenlee Ave.)
Jackson Ave. (Tower Ave. to Greenlee Ave.)
Rose Hill Ave. (Greenlee Ave. to corp. Limits)
Church St. (Greenlee Ave. to Rose Hill Ave.)




**METROPOLITAN SEWER DISTRICT
OF GREATER CINCINNATI**

1600 Gest Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45204
513-244-1300
www.msdc.org

James A. Parrott
Executive Director

Customer Service
513-352-4900

Emergency Service
513-352-4900



June 5, 2008

Mr. Stan Messerly, P.E.
MessCo Engineering
2766 Wasson Road
Cincinnati, OH 45209

**Subject: Conditional Availability of Sewers
30 Single Family Residences
Auditor's Parcel No(s). 582-7-42 and -234
Baker Avenue
City of St. Bernard
Availability Number A199-2008
File Number HMD0800162**

Dear Mr. Messerly:

This is to acknowledge your request for sewer availability for the above-mentioned location, received at MSD on May 29, 2008.

We regret to inform you that sanitary sewer service is currently not available for the development as described in your request due to the presence of Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) # 033, for which there are currently insufficient connection credits to meet your request. The proposed development may move forward only at such time that the required 28.00 connection credits become available resulting from one of the following:

1. Participating in a Section 516 sewer remediation project per the MSD Rules and Regulations; for the purpose of reducing the amount of inflow/infiltration into CSO# 033 during wet weather.
2. Utilizing connection credits that may be available at a future date as a result of an MSD Capital Improvement Project. We have placed this development on the CSO# 033 waiting list and will notify you should connection credits become available in the future.

At such time that connection credits for the above-mentioned CSO have been secured, sewer availability will be additionally subject to the following conditions:

1. The development area can be serviced via sanitary sewer number 4559.
2. All plans and construction shall comply with the latest edition of the "Rules and Regulations" manual governing the design, construction, operation, and use of sanitary and combined sewers... available from the Division of Wastewater Engineering - MSD, 1600 Gest Street, Cincinnati 45204, or from <http://www.msdc.org/downloads/>.
3. Private sanitary sewer easements with the right of entry for maintenance will be required for all portions of the proposed building sewer that will traverse existing or subdivided parcels other than the one to be serviced. Recorded copies of the executed easement, and of the revised deeds for the lands of the grantors referencing the private sewer easement, must be submitted to MSD at the time of application for a tap permit.
4. A street license agreement or equivalent instrument must be secured for all portions of the proposed building sewer that will be located within a dedicated public right of way, and must be presented before a tap permit will be issued. City of St. Bernard officials should be contacted concerning the details and requirements for obtaining the necessary agreement.
5. A mainline sewer relocation may be required for the proposed development. Concept and detail plans must be submitted for MSD review and approval in accordance with Articles VI and VII of the latest revision of the MSD Rules and Regulations.

A Permit to Install is required from the Ohio EPA before MSD will grant final approval of Detail Plans for sanitary sewer construction. The permit application shall be prepared by a Registered Ohio Professional Engineer for submittal by MSD to the Ohio EPA. No construction of a mainline extension can begin prior to obtaining a PTI from the Ohio EPA.

(Continued on Page 2)

Page 2
Mr. Stan Messerly
June 5, 2008


A twenty-foot wide public sanitary sewer easement shall be dedicated for all portions of the proposed mainline extension which will be located outside of a dedicated public right of way. This easement shall be dedicated by plat, prepared in accordance with MSD, Hamilton County and State of Ohio standards, and shall be submitted to MSD for review prior to execution by the grantors.

6. A public sewer traverses the lands of the proposed development. There shall be no grading of soils nor the construction of any structure or retaining wall within the recorded or prescribed easements of public sewers traversing the site until such time that all requirements of Sections 206 and 406 of the MSD Rules and Regulations have been fully satisfied.
7. A tap permit must be obtained in accordance with Section 1201 of the MSD Rules and Regulations. The sewer contractor must contact the MSD Field Office at 244-1366 for sewer inspection after tap permit is issued. The sewer contractor must be licensed and bonded with MSD.
8. Each structure or each dwelling to be provided with a separate water service and meter, shall also be serviced by a separate and completely independent building sewer tapping into the sanitary sewer in accordance with Section 1202 of the MSD Rules and Regulations.
9. Roof drains, foundation drains, cooling water, swimming pool water or other clean water connections to the sanitary sewer system are prohibited in accordance with Section 401 of the MSD Rules and Regulations. A notarized affidavit stating that the sanitary wastewaters are free of such clear waters must be submitted to MSD before a tap permit will be issued. The municipality in which the property resides should be consulted regarding the requirements for the collection, detention, and conveyance of storm waters.

The conditional availability of sewer service as described in this letter is based on the best information available at this time to the Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati and is subject to modification or revocation resulting from regulatory action taken by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or the State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, or from consent decrees or other judicial action ordered by federal courts of the United States Government or the courts of the State of Ohio.

If you have any questions, please call Shawn Patton at 513-244-1390 or call me at 513-557-7108.

Sincerely,



for
Peter L. Caldwell, P.E.
Principal Engineer
MSD Wastewater Engineering


cc: WWE Reading File
Availability File
Biju George (MSD)
City of St. Bernard

PLC:sdp

Available at: 11240000 1620 Baker Avenue




Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard




Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard




Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard



Jefferson Avenue



Jefferson Avenue
City of St. Bernard

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Program Year 2009 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010), jurisdictions shall provide the following support information to help determine which projects will be funded. Information on this form must be accurate, and where called for, based on sound engineering principles. Documentation to substantiate the individual items, as noted, is required. The applicant should also use the rating system and its' addendum as a guide. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A GRANT, WILL YOU BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A LOAN IF ASKED BY THE DISTRICT? X YES NO (ANSWER REQUIRED)

Note: Answering "Yes" will not increase your score and answering "NO" will not decrease your score.

1) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?

Give a statement of the nature of the deficient conditions of the present facility exclusive of capacity, serviceability, health and/or safety issues. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded. Use documentation (if possible) to support your statement. Documentation may include (but is not limited to): ODOT BR86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included in the original application. Examples of deficiencies include: structural condition; substandard design elements such as widths, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, etc.

The existing facility is exhibiting severe distress and has an extremely rough driving surface. Severe alligator cracking is indicative of base failure. The street was constructed in the 1920's with no record of any asphalt overlay in this area since the 1960's. The City has utilized an asphalt emulsion and crushed aggregate (slurry seal) product in the past to help extend the life of the asphalt. However the pavement is now severely deteriorated and is at the end of its useful life. The curb is crumbling in many sections, estimated at over 60 percent of the project limits. Due to the extensive deficiencies, the pavement and base must be reconstructed and the curb replaced.

2) How important is the project to the safety of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

Give a statement of the projects effect on the safety of the service area. The design of the project is intended to reduce existing accident rate, promote safer conditions, and reduce the danger of risk, liability or injury. (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, and highway capacity.) Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data. The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.

The deteriorating pavement has caused the driving surface to become uneven, resulting in an unsafe driving condition. The new pavement section will correct this deficiency. Additionally, the existing fire hydrant spacing is substandard (see attached letter from St. Bernard Fire Chief) based upon NFPA recommended 300 ft. spacing. This results in an unsafe condition with respect to fire protection. Existing fire hydrants will be replaced and new fire hydrants added to meet the current standards and correct the deficiency.

Additionally, GCWW has indicated that they will replace their existing substandard 6-inch main (see attached map) with a new 8-inch water main (see attached e-mail correspondence). This water main replacement will occur ONLY in conjunction with the roadway improvement project. The new 8-inch

water main will provide additional fire flow volume, and together with the additional fire hydrants, will greatly improve fire protection in this area.

3) How important is the project to the health of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

Give a statement of the projects effect on the health of the service area. The design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate potential for disease, or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area. (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project by improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities, etc.). Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data. The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.

The existing downspout lines and area drains for most of the adjacent buildings are draining to the existing sanitary sewer (see attached violation map). The sanitary sewer is tributary to combined sewer overflow (CSO) No. 33 as shown on the attached MSD map. The project will include the installation of roof drain stub outs that will connect to the upgraded storm sewer system, removing storm flow from the sanitary sewer system. The storm sewer will connect to the system in Kemper Avenue which drains to an upgraded storm sewer previously installed in Washington Avenue. Removal of significant stormwater flows from the local sanitary sewer and ultimately from the CSO will benefit the health of the residents along Jefferson and others downstream that are tributary to the CSO.

4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying jurisdiction?

The applying agency must submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance.

Priority 1 Jefferson Avenue Improvements

Priority 2 Fisher Place Improvements

Priority 3 Church Street Improvements

Priority 4 _____

Priority 5 _____

5) To what extent will the user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project?

(example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.).

No participation – Zero (0)%

6) Economic Growth – How will the completed project enhance economic growth

Give a statement of the projects effect on economic growth (be specific).

N/A

7) Matching Funds - LOCAL

The information regarding local matching funds is to be filed by the applicant in Section 1.2 (b) of the Ohio Public Works Association's "Application For Financial Assistance" form.

8) Matching Funds - OTHER

The information regarding local matching funds is to be filed by the applicant in Section 1.2 (c) of the Ohio Public Works Association's "Application For Financial Assistance" form. If MRF funds are being used for matching funds, the MRF application must have been filed by Friday, August 29, 2008 for this project with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office. List below all "other" funding the source(s).

Local funding is utilized for matching funds for this project.

9) Will the project alleviate serious traffic problems or hazards or respond to the future level of service needs of the district?

Describe how the proposed project will alleviate serious traffic problems or hazards (be specific).

Level of Service (LOS) calculations shall be for the improvements being made in the application. If this project is a phase of a larger project then any preceding phases shall be considered conditions for LOS calculations. Any future project phases shall not be considered as part of this applications LOS calculations.

For roadway betterment projects, provide the existing and proposed Level of Service (LOS) of the facility using the methodology outlined within AASHTO'S "Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" and the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual.

<u>No Build</u>	<u>Proposed Geometry</u>
Current Year LOS _____	Current Year LOS _____
Design Year LOS _____	Design Year LOS _____

If the proposed design year LOS is not "C" or better, explain why LOS "C" cannot be achieved.

10) If SCIP/LTIP funds were granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?

If SCIP/LTIP funds are awarded, how soon after receiving the Project Agreement from OPWC (tentatively set for July 1 of the year following the deadline for applications) would the project be under contract? The Support Staff will review status reports of previous projects to help judge the accuracy of a jurisdiction's anticipated project schedule.

Number of months 2

a.) Are preliminary plans or engineering completed? Yes x No _____ N/A _____

b.) Are detailed construction plans completed? Yes _____ No x N/A _____

c.) Are all utility coordination's completed? Yes _____ No x N/A _____

d.) Are all right-of-way and easements acquired (if applicable)?

Yes _____ No _____ N/A x

If no, how many parcels needed for project? _____ Of these, how many are: Takes _____

Temporary _____

Permanent _____

For any parcels not yet acquired, explain the status of the ROW acquisition process for this project.

e.) Give an estimate of time needed to complete any item above not yet completed. 8 Months.

11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact?

Give a brief statement concerning the regional significance of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

12) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the jurisdiction's economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

13) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure?

Describe what formal action has been taken which resulted in a ban of the use of or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of building permits, etc. The ban must have been caused by a structural or operational problem to be considered valid. Submission of a copy of the approved legislation would be helpful.

The Metropolitan Sewer District has placed a moratorium on development in the area tributary to CSO #33 (see attached letter). The project will remove stormwater flow from the local sanitary sewer (ref. part 3, Health), which is a necessary step in the process of ultimately reducing the stormwater inflows to CSO #33 and eventually removing the moratorium and allowing new development.

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? Yes X No _____ N/A _____

14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?

For roads and bridges, multiply current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) by 1.20. For inclusion of public transit, submit documentation substantiating the count. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to the restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by 4. User information must be documented and certified by a professional engineer or the jurisdictions' C.E.O.

Traffic: ADT 1,100 X 1.20 = 1,320 Users

Water/Sewer: Homes _____ X 4.00 = _____ Users

15) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure?

The applying jurisdiction shall list what type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for. (Check all that apply)

Optional \$5.00 License Tax X

Infrastructure Levy _____ Specify type _____

Facility Users Fee _____ Specify type _____

Dedicated Tax _____ Specify type _____

Other Fee, Levy or Tax _____ Specify type _____

**SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM
ROUND 23 - PROGRAM YEAR 2009
PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA
JULY 1, 2009 TO JUNE 30, 2010**

NAME OF APPLICANT: City of St. Bernard

NAME OF PROJECT: Jefferson Ave. Improvements

RATING TEAM: 1

General Statement for Rating Criteria

Points awarded for all items will be based on engineering experience, field verification, application information and other information supplied by the applying agency, which is deemed to be relevant by the Support Staff. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RATING

1) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?

25 - Failed

23 - Critical

20 - Very Poor

17 - Poor

15 - Moderately Poor

10 - Moderately Fair

5 - Fair Condition

0 - Good or Better

Appeal Score

Criterion 1 - Condition

Condition of the particular infrastructure to be repaired, reconstructed or replaced shall be a measure of the degree of reduction in condition from its original state. Historic pavement management data based on ASTM D6433-99 rating system may be submitted as documentation. Capacity, serviceability, safety and health shall not be considered in this criterion. Any documentation the Applicant wishes to be considered must be included in the application package.

Definitions:

Failed Condition - requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (E.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: complete removal and replacement of bridge; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system.

Critical Condition - requires partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway/curbs can be saved; Bridges: removal and replacement of bridge with abutment modification; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system.

Very Poor Condition - requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: superstructure replacement; Underground: repair of joints and/or replacement of pipe sections.

Poor Condition - requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: extensive patching of substructure and replacement of deck; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs.

Moderately Poor Condition - requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: major structural patching and/or major deck repair.

Moderately Fair Condition - requires extensive maintenance to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: thin or no overlay with extensive crack sealing, minor partial depth and/or slurry or rejuvenation; Bridges: minor structural patching, deck repair, erosion control.)

Fair Condition - requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: slurry seal, rejuvenation or routine crack sealing to the roadway; Bridges: minor structural patching.)

Good or Better Condition - little to no maintenance required to maintain integrity.

Note: If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will **NOT** be considered for SCIP/LTIP funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

2) How important is the project to the safety of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

25 - Highly significant importance

Appeal Score

20 - Considerably significant importance

15 - Moderate importance

10 - Minimal importance

5 - Poorly documented importance

0 - No measurable impact

Criterion 2 – Safety

The applying agency shall include in its application the type of deficiency that currently exists and how the intended project would improve the situation. For example, have there been vehicular accidents attributable to the problems cited? Have they involved injuries or fatalities? In the case of water systems, are existing hydrants non-functional? In the case of water lines, is the present capacity inadequate to provide volumes or pressure for adequate fire protection? **In all cases, specific documentation is required.** Mentioned problems, which are poorly documented, generally will not receive more than 5 points.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply. **Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.**

3) How important is the project to the health of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

25 - Highly significant importance

Appeal Score

20 - Considerably significant importance

15 - Moderate importance

10 - Minimal importance

5 - Poorly documented importance

0 - No measurable impact

Criterion 3 – Health

The applying agency shall include in its application the type, frequency, and severity of the health problem that would be eliminated or reduced by the intended project. For example, can the problem be eliminated only by the project, or would routine maintenance be satisfactory? If basement flooding has occurred, was it storm water or sanitary flow? What complaints if any are recorded? In the case of underground improvements, how will they improve health if they are storm sewers? How would improved sanitary sewers improve health or reduce health risk? **In all cases, quantified documentation is required.** Mentioned problems, which are poorly documented, generally will not receive more than 5 points.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply. **Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.**

4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying agency?

Note: Applying agency's priority listing (part of the Additional Support Information) must be filed with application(s).

25 - First priority project

Appeal Score

20 - Second priority project

15 - Third priority project

10 - Fourth priority project

5 - Fifth priority project or lower

Criterion 4 – Jurisdiction's Priority Listing

The applying agency **must** submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance. The form is included in the Additional Support Information.

- 5) To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project?
- ☒ 10 - Less than 10%
 - ☐ 9 - 10% to 19.99%
 - ☐ 8 - 20% to 29.99%
 - ☐ 7 - 30% to 39.99%
 - ☐ 6 - 40% to 49.99%
 - ☐ 5 - 50% to 59.99%
 - ☐ 4 - 60% to 69.99%
 - ☐ 3 - 70% to 79.99%
 - ☐ 2 - 80% to 89.99%
 - ☐ 1 - 90% to 95%
 - ☐ 0 - Above 95%

Appeal Score

Criterion 5 – User Fee-funded Agency Participation

To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project? (Example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.). The applying agency must submit documentation.

- 6) **Economic Growth – How the completed project will enhance economic growth (See definitions).**

- 10 - The project will directly secure new employment
- 5 - The project will permit more development
- ☒ 0 - The project will not impact development

Appeal Score

Criterion 6 – Economic Growth

Will the completed project enhance economic growth and/or development ~~the project will not impact development?~~

Definitions:

Secure new employment: The project as designed will secure development/employers, which will immediately add new permanent employees ~~to the project~~. The applying agency must submit details.

Permit more development: The project as designed will permit additional business development/employment. The applying agency must supply details.

The project will not impact development: The project will have no impact on business development.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply.

- 7) **Matching Funds - LOCAL**

- 10 - This project is a loan or credit enhancement
- ☒ 10 - 50% or higher
- ☐ 8 - 40% to 49.99%
- ☐ 6 - 30% to 39.99%
- ☐ 4 - 20% to 29.99%
- ☐ 2 - 10% to 19.99%
- ☐ 0 - Less than 10%

List total percentage of "Local" funds 50 %

Criterion 7 – Matching Funds – Local

The percentage of matching funds which come directly from the budget of the applying agency. Ten points shall be awarded if a loan request is at least 50% of the total project cost. (If the applying agency is not a user fee funded agency, any funds to be provided by a user fee generating agency will be considered "Matching Funds – Other").

8)

Matching Funds – OTHER

List total percentage of “Other” funds _____%

- 10 – 50% or higher
- 8 – 40% to 49.99%
- 6 – 30% to 39.99%
- 4 – 20% to 29.99%
- 2 – 10% to 19.99%
- 1 – 1% to 9.99%
- 0 – Less than 1%**

List below each funding source and percentage

_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %

Criterion 8 – Matching Funds - Other

The percentage of matching funds that come from funding sources other than those mentioned in Criterion 7. A letter from the outside funding agency stating their financial participation in the project and the amount of funding is required to receive points. For MRF, a copy of the current application form filed with the Hamilton County Engineer’s Office meets the requirement.

9)

Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or hazards or respond to the future level of service needs of the district?

- 10 - Project design is for future demand.
- 8 - Project design is for partial future demand.
- 6 - Project design is for current demand.
- 4 - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity.
- 0 - Project design is for no increase in capacity.**

Appeal Score

Criterion 9 – Alleviate Capacity Problems

The applying agency shall provide a narrative, along with pertinent support documentation, which describe the existing deficiencies and showing how congestion will be reduced or eliminated and how service will be improved to meet the needs of any expected growth or development. A formal capacity analysis must accompany the application to receive more than 4 points. Projected traffic or demand should be calculated as follows:

Formula:

Existing volume x design year factor = projected volume

Design Year	Design year factor		
	Urban	Suburban	Rural
20	1.40	1.70	1.60
10	1.20	1.35	1.30

Definitions:

Future demand – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for twenty-year projected demand or fully developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.

Partial future demand – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for ten-year projected demand or partially developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.

Current demand – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service only for existing demand and conditions.

Minimal increase – Project will reduce but not eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide a minimal but less than sufficient increase in existing capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

No increase – Project will have no effect on existing congestion or deficiencies and provide no increase in capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

10) **Readiness to Proceed - If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?**

- 5 Will be under contract by December 31, 2009 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 20 & 21
3 - Will be under contract by March 31, 2010 and/or one delinquent project in Rounds 20 & 21
0 - Will not be under contract by March 31, 2010 and/or more than one delinquent project in Rounds 20 & 21

Criterion 10 – Readiness to Proceed

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and status of design plans. A project is considered delinquent when it has not received a notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC. An applying agency receiving approval for a project and subsequently canceling the same after the bid date on the application will receive zero (0) points under this round and the following round.

11) **Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider origination and destination of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, and number of jurisdictions served, etc.**

10 – Major Impact

Appeal Score

8 – Significant Impact

6 – Moderate Impact

4 – Minor Impact

2 – Minimal or No Impact

Criterion 11 - Regional Impact

The regional significance of the infrastructure that is being repaired or replaced.

Definitions:

Major Impact – Roads: Major Arterial: A direct connector to an Interstate Highway; Arterials are intended to provide a greater degree of mobility rather than land access. Arterials generally convey large traffic volumes for distances greater than one mile. A major arterial is a highway that is of regional importance and is intended to serve beyond the county. It may connect urban centers with one another and/or with outlying communities and employment or shopping centers. A major arterial is intended primarily to serve through traffic.

Significant Impact – Roads: Minor Arterial: A roadway, also serving through traffic, that is similar in function to a major arterial, but operates with lower traffic volumes, serves trips of shorter distances (but still greater than one mile), and may provide a higher degree of property access than do major arterials.

Moderate Impact – Roads: Major Collector: A roadway that provides for traffic movement between local roads/streets and arterials or community-wide activity centers and carries moderate traffic volumes over moderate distances (generally less than one mile). Major collectors may also provide direct access to abutting properties, such as regional shopping centers, large industrial parks, major subdivisions and community-wide recreational facilities, but typically not individual residences. Most major collectors are also county roads and are therefore through streets.

Minor Impact – Roads: Minor Collector: A roadway similar in functions to a major collector but which carries lower traffic volumes over shorter distances and has a higher degree of property access. Minor collectors may serve as main circulation streets within large, residential neighborhoods. Most minor collectors are also township roads and streets and may, or may not, be through streets.

Minimal or No Impact – Roads: Local: A roadway that is primarily intended to provide access to abutting properties. It tends to accommodate lower traffic volumes, serves short trips (generally within neighborhoods), and provides connections preferably only to collector streets rather than arterials.

12) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 Points

8 Points

6 Points

4 Points

2 Points

Criterion 12 – Economic Health

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the applying agency's economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

13) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure?

10 - Complete ban, facility closed

Appeal Score

8 – 80% reduction in legal load or 4-wheeled vehicles only

7 – Moratorium on future development, *not* functioning for current demand

6 – 60% reduction in legal load

5 – Moratorium on future development, functioning for current demand

4 – 40% reduction in legal load

2 – 20% reduction in legal load

1 – Less than 20% reduction in legal load

?

Criterion 13 - Ban

The applying agency shall provide documentation to show that a facility ban or moratorium has been formally placed. The ban or moratorium must have been caused by a structural or operational problem. Points will only be awarded if the end result of the project will cause the ban to be lifted.

14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?

10 - 30,000 or more

Appeal Score

8 - 21,000 to 29,999

6 - 12,000 to 20,999

4 - 3,000 to 11,999

2 - 2,999 and under

Criterion 14 - Users

The applying agency shall provide documentation. A registered professional engineer or the applying agency's C.E.O must certify the appropriate documentation. Documentation may include current traffic counts, households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for the roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

15) Has the applying agency enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure? *(Provide documentation of which fees have been enacted.)*

5 - Two or more of the above

Appeal Score

3 - One of the above

0 - None of the above

Criterion 15 – Fees, Levies, Etc.

The applying agency shall document (in the "Additional Support Information" form) which type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for.